

STADIUM IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE
PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

Tuesday October 9, 2012

3:30 – 5:30 p.m.

319 City Hall

Meeting Minutes

Subcommittee members present: *Chair:* David Wilson. *Members:* Russ Adams, Hussein Ahmed, Chris Ferguson, David Fields, Sarah Harris, Clint Hewitt, Betsy Hodges, Diane Hofstede, Wade Luneburg, Peter McLaughlin, Jim Norkosky.

Subcommittee members excused: Rolf Engh

Guests: Michele Kelm-Helgen (MSFA), Lester Bagley, Larry Redmond (Mn Vikings), Elizabeth Cannon (for Rolf Engh), Shoree Pierce

Staff/consultants present: Peter Brown, Hilary Dvorak, Chuck Lutz, Sally Westby

1.0 Call to order – the meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by chair David Wilson. Wilson introduced the newest member of the subcommittee, Jim Norkosky representing the East Downtown Council.

2.0 Approval of minutes of 9/10/12 Planning Subcommittee – It was **MOVED** and **SECONDED** that the minutes of the 9/10/12 Planning Subcommittee be approved. Motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

3.0 Update –

- *Architect Selection* - Chuck Lutz reported that HKS has been selected as the stadium architect. Representatives of HKS will be at the 10/15 Implementation Committee (IC) meeting to make a presentation and answer questions. There will also be a public meeting with the architects on 10/15 from 5:30 – 7 p.m. at the Convention Center. HKS is familiar with the stadium site as they were hired to do designs for refurbishing the dome when that was considered a few years ago. The firm highlighted sustainability at its interview and is committed to hiring local and targeted group contractors and workers.
- *Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)*-. The EIS process for the Stadium will be reviewed at the November 19th IC meeting. One of the Implementation Committee's roles is to comment on the EIS to the Minneapolis City Council. The City Council is charged with sending a formal communication regarding the EIS to the Metropolitan Sports Facility Authority (MSFA).

4.0 Review and approval of Planning Subcommittee Work Plan (appendix A) – Chair Wilson noted that the purpose the subcommittee is to “ensure that the stadium is integrated into the surrounding area in a way that maximizes the benefit of this major investment for the nearby neighborhoods, the city and the region”.

The subcommittee's key work product will be a set of planning principles that reflect the Implementation Committee's Vision and promote a desirable urban environment that benefits from and complements the new stadium. The subcommittee has until next summer to complete its work. Subcommittee meetings for 2013 cannot be set until the City Council sets its calendar later this year.

Discussion ensued regarding the relationship between the proposed work plan and the design schedule under which architects will be working. Peter McLaughlin noted the importance of the Planning Subcommittee getting its design principles to the architects before the design gets too far along. Betsy Hodges pointed out the importance of the interplay between the work of the Design and Planning Subcommittees.

Michele Kelm-Helgen said that the architects' work schedule had not yet been set but that it would be shared with the subcommittee as soon as it was available. January 2013 is probably the earliest that initial versions of a Schematic Design for the stadium would be ready.

Given how quickly the stadium design will be developed, there was agreement with Chair Wilson's suggestion that the version of planning principles agreed upon at today's meeting should be transmitted to the architects so they could consider them as they began design work. The draft principles will also be shared with the IC at the 10/15 meeting.

Clint Hewitt suggested that an assessment tool be devised so that the subcommittee could more easily review how well iterations of the stadium design fit with the subcommittee's planning principles. Staff will draft an assessment tool.

In response to a question from Diane Hofstede, Lutz said that the Implementation Committee does not have public communication built into its schedule but that the MSFA does. The MFSA will be setting up listening sessions around the state to hear what people's thoughts about the stadium. The first such meeting will be at the Convention Center this evening.

David Fields reported that the East Downtown Council (EDC), Elliot Park Neighborhood, Inc. (EPNI) and the Downtown Minneapolis Neighborhood Association (DMNA) are planning a joint meeting discuss the stadium. It was suggested that the Implementation Committee members be invited to the meeting as well as representatives of the Downtown Council.

Based on the discussion above, it was the consensus of the committee that the work plan be adopted.

5.0 Principles - Peter Brown reviewed the manner in which the draft principles have been developed. The IC chairs drafted a stadium vision statement in August, which has since gone through numerous revisions in committee and subcommittees (see page 1 appendix B). At the same time, the Design and Planning Subcommittees have been working on draft principles. The Design Subcommittee's scope is

to develop principles that relate to the \$975 million project (the stadium, plaza and parking).

Discussion ensued regarding the principles developed so far by the Planning Subcommittee (pages 5 - 6 of appendix B). The initial paragraph under each principle is aspirational with more specific items underneath. The principles are not meant to be proscriptive but instead focus on important areas that the architects should consider as they develop the stadium design.

In response to a question from McLaughlin, Brown said that the planning principles are not directly related to the stadium design. They are more related to the context in which the building will be built. However, there are clear connections between the planning and design principles. The planning principles will relate to the City's comprehensive plan and will be used as part of the checklist for the EIS and the design of the Stadium

Committee members pointed out a number of areas that appeared to be missing in the planning principles or on which more focus was needed. These included:

- A robust safety strategy
- Integration of the stadium and the surrounding areas – connections to downtown, Cedar Riverside and Washington Ave.
- Winter and night time activation of the area
- Inclusion of the diverse backgrounds and talents of residents of the area
- The need for parking facilities and skyways to serve the surrounding area long term and not just on game days
- The impact of the stadium on the street grid
- The importance of working in conjunction with existing neighborhood plans.
- Placement of retail uses in areas of the stadium where they could be easily accessed by nearby residents/passersby.
- The importance of considering all modes of transportation (foot, bike, transit and private vehicles).
- Being able to see inside and outside the building
- The arts, with an emphasis on cultural diversity
- Economic sustainability – having buildings and streetscape that will look good 10 years from now

Lutz said that 1100 additional parking spaces would need to be provided for stadium users. These spaces do not include the existing parking lots. Staff will schedule a parking discussion for a future meeting.

McLaughlin suggested that co-location of retail uses in the stadium might not always work. For these to be successful, there has to be a business model that works. Sarah Harris suggested looking at soccer stadiums and how they work in regard to co-location. As desirable has having some neighborhood related businesses in the stadium might be (e.g. a sports and health club), Fields noted the importance of not competing or limiting business opportunities in the neighborhood.

Hewitt suggested highlighting certain aspects of the principles without actually deleting any language. Some of the principles are more relevant than others to the design work that the architects need to do right now. For example, said David Wilson, while “re-establishing the street grid” is planning principle, how the street grid is re-established will influence design. Brown said that the architects would likely look at design alternatives first while keeping in mind the goal of re-establishing the street grid if possible.

Fields noted that transit oriented design, shared parking and re-establishment of the street grid seemed to be key principles that kept coming up in discussion. Sarah Harris pointed out that “re-establishing” connections should involve views as well as streets. Hilary Dvorak suggested that there be specific language calling for not closing 11th and Chicago Avenues and to maintaining a view corridor on 5th street.

Russ Adams pointed out the importance of how they stadium related to transit, restaurant/retails locations, and to promenades leading to and from it. Brown noted that these topics relate to earlier discussions about the importance of getting to stadium in pleasant ways and to there being vistas in and out of the stadium and connections through the site.

Hussein Ahmed spoke to the importance of the stadium accessibility. People should be able to easily walk into the stadium and access its facilities. A world-class facility should have world-class cuisine that brings people together. Lutz said that there is a great interest by City Council members in having diverse food vendors in the stadium.

Adams expressed concern about placing too much emphasis on the stimulative effect of the stadium. However, he is very interested in having more businesses and housing in the area. Encouraging new businesses and housing, along with re-establishing the street grid, should be priority principles.

Jim Norkosky spoke to the importance of the principles related to safety, access, and the encouragement of additional business and housing.

Hodges noted the benefit of having the planning and design principles in place in case the stadium does **not** turn out to have a great stimulative effect. At the same time, if the design is a success, the principles could help maximize its benefits.

Lutz said that we will have the most urban stadium site in the country. As such it provides both challenges and opportunities.

Sarah Harris suggested paying attention to other developments and constructions projects in the area to which the planning principals might relate (e.g. the reconstruction of the LRT stop, the I94 exit, re-design of Chicago Ave.)

Based on above discussion, it was the consensus of the subcommittee that:

- All planning principles in appendix B would remain
- Staff should cluster and consolidate the principles while at the same time streamlining them so that they are focused on the most important priorities.
- The revised draft principles should be circulated to the subcommittee and then sent to the architects for their use as design gets underway.
- A design review score card should be devised using the planning principles

In addition, staff will look at developing a map of the properties in the area to give subcommittee members a better understanding of where existing buildings, lots are located.

6.0 Next Steps

- Finalize Planning Principals at the Nov. 13th subcommittee meeting
- Seek approval of the Planning Principals at the Nov. 19 meeting of the Implementation Committee.

7.0 Adjourn – 5:30 p.m.

8.0 Next Meeting – Tues Nov. 13 @3:30 – 5:30 p.m. Room 315 City Hall